

**SECRET**

**DRAFT:**  
26 July 1966

25X1A

Attachment #3:

SPACE LAYOUT FOR 1975-80

1. Groupings of activities in existing or proposed structures are affected by the following considerations:
- a. Functional relationships of the organizational elements.
  - b. Employment of advanced communication, automation and information processing techniques.
  - c. Sensitivity and security requirements.
  - d. Organizational integrity of Directorates, including command, control, and working methods and support relationships between offices and divisions of different Directorates.
  - e. Probably future stability or expansion of functions (beyond 1975-80).
  - f. Architectural and engineering characteristics of present and proposed Langley structures and the relative costs of alteration or relocation of special purpose space now in Headquarters building versus new construction to serve the same function.

NOTE: Architectural and engineering considerations are considered generally in this paper, but detailed engineering cost estimates must be left for later consideration by the Building Planning Group working in coordination with an architect-engineer.

2. Proper juxtaposition and configuration of new structures in the Langley area with facilities for rapid circulation of personnel among buildings will ameliorate problems of extensive coordination between offices having close functional relationships. Likewise, facilities for secure visual, voice and written communications between the buildings will mitigate many of the current difficulties caused by wide separation of related activities and parts of individual offices. Thus, the location of individual activities in relation to associated offices will be only one of the important factors in space layout planning. Other considerations include grouping of activities according to types of space needed (e.g. industrial type construction) to permit the design and construction of special purpose facilities to meet common needs on an economical basis. Construction, relocation and alteration costs need to be

SECRET

balanced.

3. Groupings of functions and future space layout should recognize increased sophistication of information processing techniques using electronic mechanization. This will require design and ~~xxxxx~~ construction of special features and utilities which for efficiency and economy reasons should be concentrated in the new buildings. The fact is, however, that the advance in such techniques will not wait and installations of expensive equipment requiring extensive alterations to existing space will be necessary before any of the new buildings will be ready. The extent to which it will be economical and feasible to relocate such expensive installations will depend on later engineer feasibility studies. While it is most difficult to judge beyond 1975-80, it appears from the data at hand that those Agency elements most directly concerned with processing information may continue to expand beyond the period. This can best be taken into account by space assignment for such functions in one of the new buildings constructed for a heavy utility load and with provisions for easy expansion.

4. Activities to remain in Headquarters building. The number, size, configuration and types of new buildings to be constructed depends on the activities to be housed therein. This, in turn, depends on identification of the offices to be located in the Headquarters building. At Annex A are six possible combinations for occupancy of the Headquarters building. Other combinations can be proposed with varying degrees of logic. Adoption of one of the alternative combinations for occupancy of the Headquarters building in 1975-80 period will influence selection of offices for relocation in rented space in Rosslyn during the interim.

5. In each of the alternative combinations for the Headquarters building the DCI and his immediate offices (less Audit) are included. Likewise, in each case the production offices of DDI and part of OCR would be located in the Headquarters building. In four possible combinations, the Clandestine Services, less TSD would remain in the building. In each case the essential building support activities would be located therein, although the amount of space allotted may vary between the alternatives.

SECRET

a. Alternative "A" would house the Area Divisions of OCR (Chive) in addition to the essential DDI Production Offices. In this combination the entire Office of Communications could be included. If decision is taken to move the signal center and related functions to a new building, \_\_\_\_\_ square feet of space would be available in the Headquarters building for re-allocation. All the building support functions could be included, although some of these might, if necessary, be relocated to make space for other activities such as ~~the~~ the DDS&T in case he should desire to remain in the building with his offices located nearby in other nearby facilities.

b. Alternative "B" provided the minimum for the DDI production offices, includes the Clandestine Services and the DDS&T Directorate, less OCS which would be relocated in new special purpose space nearby. Only about ~~a~~ 50,000 square feet of building support space would be available under this combination. Alternative "B" would collocate all the substantive Agency functions which have important program affinities and working relationships. On the other hand it may prove to be more economical and efficient to house the DDS&T offices in new especially designed facilities that can be easily expanded if such is required in the future. Further engineer studies would facilitate a choice on this alternative. The disadvantage of "B" is that none of the DDS offices are collocated with the operational elements which they support.

c. Alternate "C" is identical with "B" except that it adds the CSG to the DDI space, drops ORD from that part of the DDS&T Directorate remaining in the Headquarters building and increases slightly the space for building support. Space is also available under this combination to house the immediate office of the DDS or additional building support elements.

d. Alternate "D" was designed to achieve the maximum economy with the minimum relocation of functions especially those with extensive special purpose space. The Signal Center of O/C plus related functions, the OCS with its extensive special space needs, all medical rooms, the telephone frame room, the Library and the RID would remain in place. This assumes, of course, that necessary alterations for such functions will be accomplished during the interim period so that it would be uneconomical to rebuild such expensive features in other buildings. This may not be a proper assumption in the case of several

of the activities requiring expensive special purpose space. Further engineer feasibility studies would assist on this problem.

e. Alternate "E" is included to demonstrate all the DDS offices in the Headquarters building.

f. Alternate "F" demonstrates possible space layout in the future with all major filing and reference activity collocated outside the Headquarters building and ~~xxx~~ assumes full electronic mechanization with adequate security controls. Under this alternative the ~~Library~~ Library and RID could be relocated in nearby facilities, together with the major file and reference materials from other offices. This concept is obviously rather "far out" in terms of present practices and there are many organizational and security hurdles before it can be seriously considered. However, the state of the art of visual, audio and written communication in the future may justify further examination of the thesis underlying this alternative.

6. Any of the first four ("A" thru "D") alternatives would utilize the Headquarters building primarily for office space, retaining on the ground and first floors any very expensive special purpose facilities which it would be uneconomical to relocate. A ~~more~~ more detailed discussion of space layout in 1975-80 is found at attachment #4. Just which of these special purpose facilities should be relocated required further engineering feasibility studies. Approval of all of the first four alternatives for purposed of further planning and study would permit detailed examination of all pertinent aspects of the problems involved.